

(b)(6)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DATE: JUN 18 2014

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case. This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

NON-PRECEDENT DECISION

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner seeks classification as an “alien of extraordinary ability,” pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). The director determined the petitioner had not established the sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

Congress set a very high benchmark for aliens of extraordinary ability by requiring through the statute that the petitioner demonstrate the alien’s “sustained national or international acclaim” and present “extensive documentation” of the alien’s achievements. *See* section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). The implementing regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) states that an alien can establish sustained national or international acclaim through evidence of a one-time achievement of a major, internationally recognized award. Absent the receipt of such an award, the regulation outlines ten categories of specific objective evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i) through (x). The petitioner must submit qualifying evidence under at least three of the ten regulatory categories of evidence to establish the basic eligibility requirements.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a brief. For the reasons discussed below, upon review of the entire record, the petitioner has established eligibility for the exclusive classification sought.

I. LAW

Section 203(b) of the Act states, in pertinent part, that:

(1) Priority workers. -- Visas shall first be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are aliens described in any of the following subparagraphs (A) through (C):

(A) Aliens with extraordinary ability. -- An alien is described in this subparagraph if --

(i) the alien has extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation,

(ii) the alien seeks to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability, and

(iii) the alien’s entry into the United States will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

NON-PRECEDENT DECISION

Page 3

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) and legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) have consistently recognized that Congress intended to set a very high standard for individuals seeking immigrant visas as aliens of extraordinary ability. *See* H.R. 723 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 59 (1990); 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60898-99 (Nov. 29, 1991). The term “extraordinary ability” refers only to those individuals in that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor. *Id.*; 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) requires that the petitioner demonstrate the alien’s sustained acclaim and the recognition of his achievements in the field. Such acclaim must be established either through evidence of a one-time achievement (that is, a major, international recognized award) or through the submission of qualifying evidence under at least three of the ten categories of evidence listed at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)-(x).

In 2010, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Ninth Circuit) reviewed the denial of a petition filed under this classification. *Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010). Although the court upheld the AAO’s decision to deny the petition, the court took issue with the AAO’s evaluation of evidence submitted to meet a given evidentiary criterion.¹ With respect to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv) and (vi), the court concluded that while USCIS may have raised legitimate concerns about the significance of the evidence submitted to meet those two criteria, those concerns should have been raised in a subsequent “final merits determination.” *Id.* at 1121-22.

The court stated that the AAO’s evaluation rested on an improper understanding of the regulations. Instead of parsing the significance of evidence as part of the initial inquiry, the court stated that “the proper procedure is to count the types of evidence provided (which the AAO did),” and if the petitioner failed to submit sufficient evidence, “the proper conclusion is that the applicant has failed to satisfy the regulatory requirement of three types of evidence (as the AAO concluded).” *Id.* at 1122 (citing to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)).

Thus, *Kazarian* sets forth a two-part approach where the evidence is first counted. If the petitioner satisfies at least three criteria, then USCIS will consider the evidence in the context of a final merits determination.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Evidentiary Criteria

The petitioner seeks classification as an “alien of extraordinary ability.” The director concluded that the petitioner meets the regulatory criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vii). Upon review of the entire record, we find that the petitioner’s submitted evidence also meets an additional two of the

¹ Specifically, the court stated that the AAO had unilaterally imposed novel substantive or evidentiary requirements beyond those set forth in the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv) and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vi).

NON-PRECEDENT DECISION

regulatory categories of evidence at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii) and (viii). Accordingly, the petitioner has established the minimum eligibility requirements necessary to qualify as an alien of extraordinary ability. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

B. Final Merits Determination

We will next conduct a final merits determination that considers all of the evidence in the context of whether or not the petitioner has demonstrated: (1) a “level of expertise indicating that the individual is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the[ir] field of endeavor,” 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2); and (2) “that the alien has sustained national or international acclaim and that his or her achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise.” Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). *See also Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119-20.

In the present matter, consistent with *Matter of Price*, 20 I&N Dec. 953 (Act. Assoc. Comm’r 1994), the petitioner has submitted extensive documentation of his achievements and has demonstrated a “career of acclaimed work in the field” as contemplated by Congress. H.R. Rep. No. 101-723, 59 (Sept. 19, 1990). The submitted evidence is sufficient to demonstrate the petitioner’s sustained acclaim and that his achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise.

The petitioner has worked in his field for approximately forty years and has designed and managed projects all over the world, including [REDACTED] in France, [REDACTED] in Italy, [REDACTED] in Germany, [REDACTED] in Brazil and the [REDACTED] in Turkey. The petitioner submitted letters from employers which demonstrated the leading and critical role he performed for them. In addition, the petitioner submitted evidence of the display of his work at exhibitions. He also submitted copies of articles from a variety of sources in a number of countries. While not all of the articles are about the petitioner or comply with the regulatory requirement that the petitioner include the publication, date and author, there is sufficient evidence that meets the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii). The remaining articles, including those he has been invited to write for an international trade journal discussing his projects, are relevant to the significance of the projects on which he has worked and his role for those projects. He currently owns his own business in Florida and is designing and managing projects in both the United States and abroad, including [REDACTED] in Rome. Thus, in light of the above and other evidence of record consistent with eligibility, the petitioner’s achievements are commensurate with sustained national or international acclaim at the very top of his field.

III. CONCLUSION

While not all of the petitioner’s evidence carries the weight imputed to it by the petitioner, the evidence of record sufficient to establish that he has demonstrated his eligibility for the classification sought. Specifically, upon careful review of the record, it is concluded that the petitioner has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that he is within the small percentage of individuals who have risen to the very top of his field. The evidence submitted establishes that the petitioner has sustained national or

NON-PRECEDENT DECISION

international acclaim, his achievements have been recognized in his field, he seeks to continue working in the same field and his entry will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

The burden of proof in visa petition proceedings remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has sustained that burden.

ORDER: The decision of the director is withdrawn. The appeal is sustained and the petition is approved.